

TOWN OF EAST KINGSTON, NH  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
February 19, 1998

FILE

Appointments

8:00 Site Plan Review Amendments – Continue Public Hearing  
8:30 James Bioteau – Subdivision – 24 Giles Road – Discussion

Members attending: Richard A. Smith Sr. - Chairman, Edward C. Johnson - Vice Chairman, James Roby Day, Jr. - Ex-officio, Catherine J. George, and Dr. Marston (7:43).

Absent: Alternates Robert Nigrello and Beverly Fillio.

Others attending: Sarah Campbell – RPC Circuit Rider, Glenn P. Clark – Building Inspector, James Bioteau, Atty. Jackson Casey, and Charles Marden.

Chairman Smith opened this February 19, 1998 Planning Board meeting at 7:30 p.m. with the roll call.

It was noted that the Existing Land Use Map generated by the RPC was delivered to the Planning Board.

January 29, 1998 Minutes: The Board reviewed the Planning Board minutes dated January 29, 1998 and noted corrections.

MOTION: Mrs. George motioned to accept the January 29, 1998 Planning Board minutes as corrected. Mr. Johnson second. The motion carried 4-0.

Recording Secretary Responsibilities: Chairman Smith reviewed the list of responsibilities of the planning board recording secretary. The Board approved of the list without further amendments. Chairman Smith ordered that a copy of the list be forwarded to each planning board member.

Incoming Correspondence: Chairman Smith acknowledged the following incoming correspondence.

1. NH Emergency Management – requesting the Planning Board's recommendation for additional lands to be added to the flood maps. It was noted that the RPC has GIS to use in updating the maps. Conservation Commission Chairman Larry Smith will generate a letter of response within 45 days.
2. RPC Workshops.
3. OSP – Conference America Planning Association 4/4 – 4/8 in Boston.
4. OSP – Annual Spring Conference notice for May 30, 1998.

Citizen's Survey: Mr. Day submitted a Brief Summation of the 1996 Citizen Survey (see attached). He stated that in collating the information the following similarities in citizen response are:

1. Curtail taxes
2. Preserve agricultural/rural character
3. Encourage businesses
4. Restrict appearances of buildings in town.

He also noted that the citizens of East Kingston are somewhat detached from the zoning process. They look to the planning board for bright ideas and when ideas are generated and unpopular, citizens separate even further from the board. Much criticism is directed to the planning board. In distributing the survey in 1996, citizens were given the opportunity to write out their thoughts to some of East Kingston problems, as well as write their thoughts of future goals for the town. In collecting this data, no solutions were submitted, only identifying the problem. The end result is that nothing may be done.

The Board discussed the future goals as indicated by the residents. It was suggested that the percentage of the return of completed surveys be noted on the next survey. This may encourage more response.

Mrs. George recommended the Board ask the students at the elementary school to come up with some ideas for implementing the future goals of East Kingston. This could be a project/assignment for the higher grades. Children reflect what they hear from their parents. The Board approved of Mrs. George recommendation and directed her to contact the school. Chairman Smith then requested each board member write three goals for the future goals of East Kingston to be discussed at the next meeting.

**Site Plan Review Amendments – Continued Public Hearing:** Chairman Smith opened the continued public hearing for site plan review amendments at 8:04 p.m.

Mrs. Campbell distributed a draft of the proposed architectural/aesthetic standards (see attached). The Board reviewed the draft and noted the following:

1. The Planning Board may adopt a site plan review "... to provide the harmonious and aesthetically pleasing development of the municipality and its environs".
2. The Board has authority to govern the proposed appearance.
3. Models used for this draft are from Concord, Wolfboro and Lincoln.
4. Roofs – pitched or not, the Board has the authority to waive.
5. Strict aesthetics will not encourage the development of the light industrial park.
6. Metal sheath buildings are preferred by businesses.
7. Residential characteristics cannot be expected in the light industrial park.
8. Keep the commercial district restricted to tight aesthetics and be more lenient in light industrial park.
9. The lighting paragraph is important for the light industrial park.
10. The types of fencing allowed may be too restrictive to the light industrial park.
11. Signs – who has authority. Planning Board or Selectmen?

**MOTION:** Mrs. George motioned to continue this public hearing of the proposed site plan review amendments until March 19, 1998 at 8:30 p.m. Dr. Marston second. The motion carried 4-0.

**James Bioteau – 24 Giles Road Subdivision – Discussion:** Chairman Smith opened the discussion for James Bioteau and informed Mr. Bioteau that all discussion this evening was non-binding.

Mr. Bioteau presented the Board with a preliminary map of a proposed two-lot subdivision on Giles Road. Mr. Bioteau is proposing to subdivide using the backlot provisions outlined in Article VI.B of the East Kingston Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Bioteau stated that the lot to be subdivided has 333 feet of road frontage. The Board reviewed the preliminary plan and noted the driveway for the newly proposed lot would be accessed by 108 and not Giles Road. The Giles Road access would need to cross a brook. The 108 access would need to share road access with another lot and the driveway for the newly proposed lot would exceed 800 ft in length.

The Board discussed the proposed driveway and the backlot provisions. Some members stated that the intention of the backlot provision was that the *porkchop* portion of the parcel would be used for driveway access. The Board stated that it would consider waiving the one-driveway per lot requirement. It also stated that the address to the newly proposed lot would be North Haverhill Road and not Giles Road. The Board noted the following items to be addressed by Mr. Bioteau before considering his application:

1. HISS mapping will be required for both lots (16-4-3 and the new lot).
2. Written request for waiver from Subdivision Regulation IV.D to be submitted with completed application.
3. State subdivision approval would be needed for both lots (16-4-3 and the new lot).
4. 4,000 K areas must be shown for both lots (16-4-3 and new lot).
5. All parcels including easement parcel must be shown on the plans.
6. Permanent ROW for backlot access must be recorded at the Registry of Deeds and so noted on the mylar.
7. 41-ft strip on new lot will be written as a conservation easement at the request of the applicant and so noted on mylar.
8. Soil Scientist and Licensed Land Surveyors stamp must be on the mylar.
9. Show existing house and septic system and existing and proposed driveways on mylar.
10. Full name in title box of mylar.

**Work Session:** The next planning board work session will be held on Thursday, March 5, 1998, 7:00 p.m. at the Town Offices. The agenda will include discussion of the future land map, future goals, and the proposed amendments of the site plan review.

**MOTION:** Dr. Marston motioned to adjourn. Mr. Johnson second. The motion carried 4-0 and this February 19, 1998 public planning board meeting ended at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Belcher  
Secretary

Minutes completed and on file February 23, 1998.